

From: "Vickstrom, Kyle E." <vickstromke@cdmsmith.com>

To: "Scott Coffey" <coffeyse@cdmsmith.com>

CC: "John Kern" (b) (6)

"Zhen, Davis" <Zhen.Davis@epa.gov>

"Sheldrake, Sean" <sheldrake.sean@epa.gov>

Date: 5/11/2018 11:09:15 AM

Subject: PH Surface Sediment Thin Grab Documentation

Attachments: [KEV_SampleTracking_wDateCountDepth_rev20180504_toEPA.xlsx](#)

Hi Scott,

I found 34 sampling locations where at least one thin sub-sample was rejected and not logged prior to implementation of the updated field form on 4/21/18. I've attached the Pre-RD Group sample tracking spreadsheet which calls out these sample locations. *Please note that not all of these 34 instances necessarily require a re-sampling of the location, but rather should be investigated in further detail.* For example, there are 12 sampling locations that included at least one sub-sample in the final composite sample with recovery < 20 cm, which could be retroactively acceptable. However, these sampling locations did still contain a sub-sample that was <20 cm, rejected, and not logged.

Based on the field logs, at some of these locations it is unclear if poor recovery occurs due to:

- Hard sediments
- Debris interfering with the grab sampler
- Calibrating the weight in the grab sampler (more weight added after thin sample recovered)

Some of the field logs are more detailed than others, and some of the thin sub-samples that were rejected were at least partially logged (e.g., SG-B033 and SG-B-040). Let me know if you have any questions.

Thanks,

Kyle Vickstrom, E.I.

CDM Smith | 9200 Ward Parkway, Suite 320 | Kansas City, MO 64114

T: 425-519-8372 | E: vickstromke@cdmsmith.com